

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/980,636	08/29/2002	John V Briel	36-1642	7111	
7590 08/03/2006			EXAMINER		
Nixon & Vanderhye			LANEAU, RONALD		
8th Floor 1100 North Gle	be Road	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Arlington, VA	22201-4714	3627	-		
			DATE MAILED: 08/03/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary			Application No.	Applicant(s	Applicant(s)			
			09/980,636 BRIEL ET AL.		L.			
		Ī	Examiner	Art Unit				
		1	Ronald Laneau	3627				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appea	ars on the cover shee	t with the corresponder	ce address			
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Mansions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this coming of the properties of the maximum is the toreply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DAT s of 37 CFR 1.136(munication. tatutory period will y will, by statute, ca	TE OF THIS COMMU a). In no event, however, ma apply and will expire SIX (6) buse the application to become	JNICATION. ay a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date one ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 1	of this communication. 33).			
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>25 Ma</i> v	, 2006					
·			ction is non-final.					
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims		•					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-10,20 and 21</u> is/are	pending in the	e application.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
· · · —	☐ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-10,20 and 21</u> is/are rejected.							
	☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
·	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or e	election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[7]	The specification is objected to by the	e Evaminer						
·			ted or b) objected	to by the Examiner				
, ,	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
					• •			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	for foreign pr	iority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
/-	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	i(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			ew Summary (PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or			No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application	n (PTO-152)			
	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>05252006</u> .	F10/98/08)		5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3627

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/25/06 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 10 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koreeda (5,890,137) in view of Webber, Jr (US 6,167,378).

As per claims 1, 10, 20 and 21, Koreeda discloses, an online shopping system's configuration, i.e. data management system, which is used in receiving and processing data in relation to multiple products for multiple stores, and records the product selection, payment, and delivery processing as it pertains to the ordered product, i.e. in respect of a generated product description (Abstract, Fig. 1), the system comprising: an input for product selection data (Fig. 1 - Shop System/service Center, Fig. 10 -Service enter - Shop A's Business Terminal, Fig. 14 - Product Data; cols. 5-6, lines 1-19; the product data initially had to come from the shop system as it is part of their inventory, as would new additions, etc.); a marketplace product store for

Art Unit: 3627

storing marketplace product definitions (Fig. 1 – Service Center; cols. 5-6, lines 1-19); a product selection store for storing data defining a selection of one or more products from the market place product store (Fig. 1 - Product Selection Unit/Accumulation Unit); an enterprise capability store for storing data defining capability of an enterprise in relation to supply of one or more products (Fig. 1 - on-line shopping system); and a product fulfillment data store for storing one or more product descriptions (Fig. 1-Delivery Processing Unit).

Koreeda does not disclose an association data store and a product fulfillment data store to store a product description but Webber discloses an association data store storing association data associating each product description with specified data in said enterprise capability store; and a product fulfillment data store controller arranged in operation to store a product description in said product fulfillment data store only when said enterprise capability store includes the specified data associated with said product description by said association data (col. 10, lines 20-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store association data associating each product description as taught by Webber into the system of Koreeda because it would provide a pointer identifying a seller database in which product data enabling a product transaction is stored for products that are associated with the product class.

As per claim 2, Koreeda discloses the specified data in the enterprise capability store relates to equipment necessary to support provision of a product identified in the product description (Figs. 1 and 3, including Approval center/payment collection unit, Product Delivery Payment, Settlement Network, Invoicing, Appropriate software transfer to user).

Art Unit: 3627

As per claims 3 and 4, Koreeda discloses that the product description includes order time, order expiration, and inventory information, i.e. date information together with availability date data, and the system further comprises means to review the availability date data against the date information, such that a valid product description is dependent upon compatibility between the availability date data and the date information (Figs. 3 and 14, cols. 6, 9-10 - the product download is performed each time the user utilizes the program and the product confirmation unit makes the user decide what products to buy and also is reloaded each time and thus updated information would be based upon availability, and the information is reconfirmed after the user clicks OK; the means is the repetitive download and the reconfirmation.).

Koreeda discloses claim 4 for the same reasons set forth in claim 3.

As per claims 5 and 17-19, Koreeda discloses a means to generate a link between each marketplace product definition stored in the marketplace product store to data stored in the enterprise capability store, said links being determined by a requirement in the respective marketplace product definition for specified data in the enterprise capability store, such that a valid marketplace product definition is dependent on presence of said specified data in the enterprise capability store (Koreeda links each marketplace product definition in the service center with definitions throughout the shopping system, i.e. enterprise capability store, and if each of the data is not present then there is no transaction, i.e. a valid marketplace product definition depends on presence of specified data in the online shopping system - mean to generate a link can be a computer network, the Internet, communications links - Figs. 1-3, 9A, 9B, and 10-15; cols 5-1 1).

Art Unit: 3627

4. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koreeda (5,890,137) in view of Walker et al (6,167,378) and further in view of Blinn, et al. (5,897,622).

As per claims 6, 8 and 9, Koreeda and Webber disclose as set forth above. However, neither Koreeda nor Webber discloses a means to update the specified data in the enterprise capability store and to make consequent changes to links relevant to that data. Blinn discloses administrative actions accessibly by the system administrator to provide for management of the merchant system, including actions that enable the merchant to create pages to access the database to insert, delete and update database information through the use of modify the queries stored in the database instead of modifying the system modules, thus ensuring consistent changes throughout the system and negating the need to modify application every time a merchant modifies the database, i.e. this is a means to specified data in an enterprise capability store and to make consequent changes to links relevant to that data (col. 3, lines 2-18; cols. 9-10, lines 55-4; cols. 12-14, lines 57-61). Blinn further discloses that the ability to change the data easily permits the merchant to effectively promote their products and also to guarantee the shopper consistency and reliability in the information used to make purchasing decisions (col. 3, lines 19-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store association data associating each product description as taught by Webber into the system of Koreeda because it would provide a pointer identifying a seller database in which product data enabling a product transaction is stored for products that are associated with the product class. And it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized the query system of Blinn into the combined system of Koreeda and Webber to effectuate updates/deletions in specific data in the database - online store or

Art Unit: 3627

servicing center, i.e. the enterprise capability store or market product definition, and thus make changes to links relevant to that data for the specific reasons set forth in Blinn, et al.

As per claim 7, Koreeda discloses as set forth above in claim 1. Koreeda further discloses that items may be sold as sets (Fig. 6) and discloses product descriptions (Fig. 14). However, Koreeda does not disclose that data in the enterprise capability store comprises identifiers for instances of apparatus available to support a product identified in a product description. Blinn, et al. discloses the ability to recommend related items to purchasers, i.e. cross selling through utilizing identifiers for instances of apparatus available to support a product identified in a product description (Figs. 13A and 13B; cols. 17-19, lines 18-15). Blinn further discloses that in order to effectively promote their products merchants utilize a wide variety of discounting schemes, including cross-selling and that merchants desire an online system that allows for a significantly wider variety of product discounting and sales schemes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store association data associating each product description as taught by Webber into the system of Koreeda because it would provide a pointer identifying a seller database in which product data enabling a product transaction is stored for products that are associated with the product class. And it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized the ability to recommend related items to purchasers through the mechanism taught in Blinn into the combined system of Koreeda and Webber for the specific reasons taught in Blinn, et al.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-10 and 20-21 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues only Walker are moot in view of the newly added reference (Webber, Jr US 6,167,378). Applicant further argues that the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that he has presented evidence of corresponding claim elements in the prior art and has expressly articulated the combinations and the motivations that fairly suggest Applicant's claimed invention. Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 20-21 are rejected.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3627

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 7.

examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (571) 272-6784. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Amean Ronald Laneau

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3627

rl